

DEAR SIR.—On my return home this morning I find a confirmation of what you and others told me in New York, viz: that a letter upon the Presidential question is expected from me. The views I entertained on this question, early in September, will be found in the following extract of a letter which appeared in the Evening Journal:

Those who desire the preservation of the Government and the Union, be they Democrat or Republican, will keep their eyes upon these secession emissaries; upon their northern sympathizers, and upon the Chicago Convention. We shall see how far the views of Messrs. Clay, Thompson, Sanders, &c., influence the action of that Convention. We shall see what sort of men are nominated, and what principles are avowed. If statesmen and soldiers who have, since the outbreak of the rebellion, given their services to the country, are placed upon a platform which demands a vigorous prosecution of the war, on the basis of Union and peace—which requires all in rebellion to return to their allegiance and to the enjoyment of their rights under the Constitution—if, we repeat, such men are nominated at Chicago, I shall hail the result with heartfelt joy. Such a nomination would leave every elector to choose between Mr. Lincoln and another candidate for President, equally patriotic.

"But if the Vallandigham and Sanders influence prevails at Chicago; if a candidate of even suspected loyalty be nominated, or if the Convention, in its organization or platform, gives an 'uncertain sound,' or betrays disunion proclivities, it will not only provoke the united opposition of Republicans, but lose the support of War Democrats."

"The loyal Democracy goes to Chicago with the odds and chances against them. The condition and circumstances of the country are insuperable. These advantages, however, demand increased zeal, devotion and firmness. And if, at last, malign influences prevail, the right and the duty of APPEAL REMAINS."

My reasons for desiring a change of Administration are known to those who have read what I have felt constrained to say since December 1863, first as editor of the Journal, and subsequently in occasional letters. I protested, early and earnestly, against the Abolition proclivities of the Republican party, of Congress, and of the Administration. I foresaw, more clearly than others, the certainty of a formidable rebellion—a rebellion that would try the strength of our Government and tax the energies of our whole people. In view of such an emergency I felt that no mere party, and least of all, an Abolition party, could preserve the Government and Union; that the policy of the Administration should tend to unite the North and divide the South. And what I complained of was, that just so far as Abolition counsels prevailed, they reversed this proposition, by dividing the North and uniting the South. I know, now, what I believed in 1863, that Mr. Lincoln ought to have made a Union Cabinet. Such a Cabinet and policy would have carried us through the rebellion with infinitely less expense of blood and treasure. It is, in my judgment, a mistake to have supposed that he could not sustain himself without the support of ultra Abolition. In boldly prosecuting the war for the Government and the Union, he would have been triumphantly sustained by the really and rationally patriotic masses. The influences which he sought to propitiate have been a drag both upon his Administration and the war. And after all his concessions to the insatiable spirit of radical Abolition, its leaders turned against and endeavored to overthrow him! Months after his re-nomination, Abolition leaders were engaged in a conspiracy to force his withdrawal! Hostile circulars, signed by editors of the "Evening Post," "Tribune," and "Independent," were drifting about in September; nor was the project of another Presidential nomination abandoned until three days previous to the meeting of our State Convention.

The Democratic party was represented by its National Convention. By its candidates for President and Vice-President, and in its "platform," we must find reasons for accepting or rejecting a Democratic Administration. Two facts are, in my judgment, conclusively demonstrated by the action of that convention. First, that General McClellan was not the choice of a majority of the Convention; and second, when forced to take him, the "Peace party" delegates avenged themselves by forcing their own nominee for Vice-President and their own "platform" upon the Convention. This characterizes the Democratic ticket. The "platform" offends the patriotism of every loyal elector. It offended General McClellan and all War Democrats. It contains no sentiment, no sense, no expression of opinion, from which an impartial reader can learn to which side of the war the Chicago Convention belongs! There is no word of condemnation or censure, either of secession or rebellion, in it. The portions of it not positively disloyal, are "mere glittering generalities." Indeed, so tenderly is rebellion touched that strong color is given to the charge that Washington Hunt's "armistice" plank was inserted at the

The Lancaster Gazette.

THE UNION OF THE STATES—ONE COUNTRY—ONE DESTINY.

VOL. 5. NO. 31.

LANCASTER, OHIO, OCT. 27, 1864.

Established 1826.

suggestion of the Confederate Commissioners with whom he conferred in Canada.

But why labor to prove the disloyalty of the Chicago Platform? Its real character was determined in the manner of its reception by the people. All but those whose sentiments and sympathies are with rebellion, instantly "spit upon it." There is no possibility of mistaking the language of patriotism. It rings out in a loud, clear, clarion, voice, filling the ears and warming the hearts of all true men. The Chicago Platform is essentially and unmistakably hostile to the Government, and it is known and felt to be so even by the war Democrats, who are reluctantly standing and working upon it. Should the people of the free States declare in favor of such a "platform," our Government and Union, with all the blood and treasure expended, first to establish, and now to preserve them, are hopelessly and irretrievably lost. The day that such a record is made, terminates our existence as a republic, by sponging the United States out of the map of nations. When we ourselves, "emphatically declare as the sense of the American people," in favor of a "cessation of hostilities," France and England, taking us at our word, will step in and "mediate" us into broken and separate fragments to be reconstructed, some say, upon the Germanic Confederation plan.

Democratic friends who have manfully sustained the war, and who agree with me in repudiating their "platform" claim my support of General McClellan upon his letter. With that letter were it possible to divorce him from Mr. Pendleton and the platform, I should be content. But this is quite impossible. A vote for McClellan is also a vote for Mr. Pendleton, and against Andrew Johnson!

When the rebellion broke out, Messrs. Johnson and Pendleton were Democratic members of Congress, the former from a slave, and the latter from a free State. Mr. Johnson, though perilling all he had and was, threw himself gallantly into the conflict for the Government and Union; while Mr. Pendleton, though less openly disloyal than his colleagues, Vallandigham and Long, has voted and sympathized with them, and was their candidate for Vice-President. His party cannot now point, during the whole four years of war, to a patriotic vote or a generous utterance. Upon no Congressional condemnation of rebellion has he stood with Griswold, Stebbins, Odell, and other War Democratic members of Congress. So bad, indeed is the record of Messrs. Pendleton and Long, that their districts have just elected two Union men in their places by large majorities. Can I vote for Geo. H. Pendleton against Andrew Johnson? Not can any consistent friend of his country? Certainly not. There were many earnest War Democrats in the Chicago Convention, working hard to counteract its ignominious peace proclivities. The friends of General McClellan endeavored to secure the nomination of Guthrie, Cator or Phelps for Vice-President. But failing, they fell into the common political error of acquiescence. And now the worst feature in the case is the fact that while the loyal men are satisfied with McClellan, the peace men are content with Pendleton and the Platform, all being united in support of the ticket. This throws Dean Richmond and Sanford E. Church into the canvass, shoulder to shoulder with Clement Vallandigham and Fernando Wood!

Gen. McClellan is wholly inexperienced in civil duties, his education and pursuits having been military. This, though ever to be regretted, would be peculiarly a misfortune now, for as his party is constituted, he would not be at liberty to form a loyal Cabinet. That cabinet would hamper and embarrass, if it did not control him. This, indeed, has been Mr. Lincoln's case. His party was made up of Whigs, Radical Democrats and Abolitionists. The influence of the latter elements predominating, his Cabinet took that complexion. Hence, under the auspices of a strong will in the Treasury Department, backed by corresponding influences in Congress, the Government has been crippled & the war intensified and prolonged by avowing the destruction of slavery rather than the preservation of the Government and Union as its object.

And such were General McClellan's President, would be his condition. The disloyal element predominates in his party. The Democratic United States Senators (with one exception), the leading journals, and the representative men generally, of his party, are committed, or committing themselves, to an "armistice" or peace policy. He could not, therefore, move a step until he surrendered his Administration to men and influences whose counsels would work out a peace so dishonoring in terms and so disastrous in effect as to occasion fresh and interminable wars.

The objections to General McClellan's election, are to be found, therefore, less in himself, than in his political surroundings. These are largely disloyal, and it requires a higher degree of moral courage than he possesses to shake them off. The influences which surround a President usually shape his action. Of all our Presidents, General Jackson alone, had the will to determine and pursue his own course—or, in other words, "to take the responsibility." With this knowledge we should have nothing but evil to expect from General McClellan's election as President. And deprecating, as I have done, and do, the malign "in-

fluence" of Sumner, Pomeroy, and Lane, with others of their stripe in Congress, I cannot, even to escape such evils, fly to others threatening our country with the last and worst calamity.

The Convention which nominated Pendleton, and placed McClellan on a Platform that would trip up even Lincoln, would, had the power resided in it, have made an instant peace, ingloriously recognizing the Confederate Government, and shivering this Republic into fragments! Can we, after all the sacrifices rebellion has occasioned, and when, as we hope, these sacrifices are soon to be compensated by the overthrow of our enemies, submit to such wrong and humiliation? If, as I assume, we can not and will not so dishonor our country, so degrade ourselves, and so outrage the memories of hundreds of thousands who have written their devotion to the Union in their own red blood, let us vote the Peace party down. Let us not consign all there is left of this priceless Government and precious Union, to the hands of those who are impatient for an ignominious, shameful peace "upon the best attainable terms," whether they conspire at Chicago under Vallandigham and Wood, or in Canada under Saunders and Greeley.

While the people have not had, in results, the worth of their treasure and blood; though our armies, especially of the Potomac, have not been ably handled; and though our navy has not—with some noble exceptions, for the name of Porter remains bright, and that of Farragut belongs to imperishable fame—maintained the character it won in the war with England, much has been accomplished in the right direction. Rebellion has been driven from Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Arkansas, while our army and navy hold portions of Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama and Texas. Heavy and telling blows have been dealt by Farragut, Sherman and Sheridan, and we are justified in believing that Grant will perfect his character and finish the rebellion by the conquest at Richmond. We know that the enemy in his last conscription, exhausted his material, and that he must now fight it out with the men in the field, while, if we will, in addition to the reinforcements now hastening to the front, we can bring fresh and crushing legions into action. We know that Mr. Lincoln is loyal, persevering, and devoted, and that he is doing all he can to conquer a peace. This is not all we desire, but it is vastly more than we should get from a peace party Administration.

That we have experienced enough of "The grasping, voracious, rough hand of war," sacrificed enough of treasure, and sent more than enough of our gallant sons to their "gray beds," who will deny? And that all hearts ache for peace, who can doubt?

If I demand, before this blood view, What rube, or what impudent, there is, Dear nurse of arts, pleasures and joys of life, Should not, in this best garden of the world, Our fertile Prince, put up her lovely visage?"

But the boon of peace is only to be wooed and won by persistent valor. Every truce, every sickly cry for peace aggravates and protracts the war. Until, by military mastery, the rebellion is subdued, we can have no peace on enduring terms. White feathers at the North are more dangerous to our Government and Union than the sabers and bayonets of the South. In the aspect of the war, our best and most efficient Peace Commissioners are Farragut and Sherman, Grant, Hancock and Sheridan. Meanwhile, the Administration itself should work out of its false position, and by some unequivocal act or declaration, solemnly avow that the war is prosecuted to maintain the Government and to restore the Union; and that when misguided States and people return to their allegiance, the angel of peace will revisit and bless our too severely chastised country.

Our country is in an anomalous condition. The two great political parties are embarrassed with antagonisms. The Republican party is associated with an Abolition element which first invited rebellion, and then demanded a war issue which divides the people and weakens the Government.

The Democratic party is demoralized by a "copperhead" element whose disloyalty ran that party under in 1863, and whose successful resistance at Chicago, to enlightened and patriotic action, will occasion a second Democratic collapse.

I had hoped that these ultra and malign elements would have "sloughed off" from both parties, leaving the conservative masses to unite and save the country.

In denouncing "Abolition," as I do now, and have ever done, allow me to guard against misconception. The old Whig party was ever and inflexibly opposed to slavery extension and aggression. But there was a broad and well understood distinction between the Whig opponents of slavery and the fanatical Abolitionists. With the opponents of slavery, led by John Quincy Adams, I lived and labored, in harmony, and with zeal. But we were eternally opposed by the Birney, Goodell, Garrison and other fanatical Abolitionists, who, in elections, so cast their "third party" as to elect pro-slavery Governors, Congressmen, and Presidents, and finally, by defeating Mr. Clay, brought Texas into the Union as a slave State. That class of Abolitionists threw themselves across the track of all healthful political organizations. They were the worst

enemies of the whig party then—they are "the best friends" of rebellion now. They were pestilent before, and have been destructive during the war. But my abhorrence of Abolition fanatics does not in the least weaken my detestation of a slave rebellion. The devilish ambitions fostered by that cursed Institution, may cost us our Government and Union—will, indeed, if slavery and Abolition combined can work out that great national crime. Our danger has been, and is, that Abolition, in doing precisely what I foretold, dividing the North and uniting the South—may enable rebellion and slavery to avert the penalty both so richly merit—a common grave.

It was the dread of ultra Abolition, embarrassing Mr. Lincoln in the past, and threatening embarrassment in the future, that induced me to hope for a change of Administration. I believed that a Democratic President, as earnest as Mr. Lincoln, against the rebellion, and exempted from the influences which have beset and badgered him from the beginning, could prosecute the war more successfully; and, the fighting over, would find himself less encumbered, perplexed and tormented, during the most difficult of all the duties of a President—the readjustment of our disjoined machinery of Government.

The responsibilities of the Administration have been, during its four years of trial, so great, that the Democratic party, had it been patriotic—or if it had seemed to be so—would have taken the Government. Its disloyal State organizations finally culminated at Chicago, where the right way was so clear and straight that only those who were previously bent on pursuing the wrong, could mistake it. Nor, in seasons of common danger, is there any difficulty in discriminating between patriotism and disloyalty. In a war which exhausts their substance and drains their blood, the people are never deceived. In such times they think and feel deeply. Instincts and impulses anticipate argument and jump at conclusions. Now, as in 1812, a questionable patriotism is virtually admitted disloyalty. Now, as then, the political barometer rises or falls with the changing fortunes of our armies. Victories depress, while disasters encourage the opponents of the Administration.

Heretofore, during a long political experience, it has not been useful, on the eve of a Presidential election, that my position should be defined. Nor would it now have been necessary if the life of the nation did not depend upon the result. Oppressed by this conviction, I have anxiously watched events, with a determination to be governed by them. In a canvass which involves the very existence of the Republic, men are to be judged by their fitness for the great trust to be confided to them. I have endeavored, impartially, to measure the Presidential nominees by this rule. Assuming, as I do, that both are men of integrity and patriotism, I sought and found a solution of my embarrassment in their relative associations and surroundings. I find the supporters of Mr. Lincoln solemnly pledged to and earnestly engaged in, the work of "crushing," with the army and navy of the Government, an enormously wicked rebellion. Less than this, in view of what the war has already cost, can not be submitted to. On the other hand, I find a majority of the convention by which General McClellan was nominated, "solemnly pledged" to an "armistice," and to a policy which contemplates peace and disunion. While General McClellan is supported by War Democrats, I find also that the copperheads and secessionists accept Mr. Pendleton and the platform as their portion of the inheritance.

The political "signs of the times" are full of hope and joy. Recent results convert confidence into assurance. And the sense of relief comes where the danger was most imminent. In Indiana, where treason was most rife, and traitors boldest, the triumph is overwhelming. So last year in Ohio, where the copperheads had the hardihood to present Vallandigham for Governor, the popular indignation crushed them out of political existence. Thus—if the illustration be not irrelevant—where disloyal sin abounds, patriotic grace abounds much more abundantly. Yours, truly,

THURLOW WEED.

THE DEMOCRATIC FACTIONS.
The following are believed to be among the leading sections of the harmonious Democracy:

1. Those Democrats who support Pendleton and McClellan on the Chicago Platform.
2. Those who support Pendleton and McClellan under the Chicago Platform.
3. Those who support Pendleton and McClellan on McClellan's record.
4. Those who support Pendleton and McClellan on Pendleton's record.
5. Those who support McClellan on his record, but repudiate Pendleton and the Platform.
6. Those who support Pendleton on his record, but repudiate the Platform and McClellan.
7. Those who support McClellan on the Platform, but repudiate little Mac.
8. Those who support Pendleton on the Platform, but repudiate little Mac.
9. Those who support Jeff Davis on the Platform.
10. Those who support Jeff Davis on McClellan's record.

CITY OF LANCASTER.		TOWNSHIPS AND WARDS.		NAMES.		ABSTRACT OF THE VOTES GIVEN IN THE SEVERAL TOWNSHIPS AND WARDS, OCTOBER 11, 1864.	
CITY OF LANCASTER.		TOWNSHIPS AND WARDS.		NAMES.		ABSTRACT OF THE VOTES GIVEN IN THE SEVERAL TOWNSHIPS AND WARDS, OCTOBER 11, 1864.	
Ward No. 1.		William H. Smith,		W. W. Armstrong,		Moses R. Brady,	
Ward No. 2.		Wm. S. V. Prentiss,		W. P. Richardson,		L. R. Critchfield,	
Ward No. 3.		Philip Herzog,		James Moore,		William Larwill,	
Ward No. 4.		Charles Bassell,		Luther Day,		William White,	
Ward No. 5.		Horace Wilder,		P. Van Trump,		Mack C. Whiteley,	
Ward No. 6.		A. S. Boys,		A. S. Ramsey,		Job E. Stevenson,	
Ward No. 7.		Wm. E. Finch,		Seth Weldy,		Tall Slough,	
Ward No. 8.		Joab Stafford,		Emanuel Shuler,		David Pence,	
Ward No. 9.		William Schopp,		Henry S. Eckert,		Joel Shaffer,	
Ward No. 10.		Charles Pairan,		David Ewing,		Ferdinand Getz,	
Ward No. 11.		William Mitchell,					

Voter's Catechism.

PLAIN QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FOR THE CAMPAIGN.

- Q. Who began this wicked war?
A. The friends and political associates of the McClellan Peace Democracy.
- Q. How did they begin the war?
A. By firing on a U. S. Steamer, carrying food to Union soldiers in the forts of Charleston harbor, and by firing on old Fort Sumter.
- Q. For what did they begin the war?
A. For the perpetuity of slavery, as declared by their Vice-President, Mr. Stephens.
- Q. Does the McClellan Democracy uphold the Southern Rebellion in their attempt to prolong and extend slavery?
A. Yes. Their Chicago platform, and all their orators, advocate the doctrine of supreme State Rights, including the right of secession, slaveholding, bigamy, (as with the Mormons), and anything that a State may choose to do.
- Q. Is McClellan really in favor of these bad principles?
A. Yes, according to the papers and speakers who advocate his election, such as Wood, Voorhees, Vallandigham, Cox, and company; also, see his letter in favor of Judge Woodward's election as Governor of Pennsylvania. Woodward declared that he "felt no interest in this war," and he was supported for Governor by all the rebel sympathizers in his State, and in whose favor Lee made a raid into Pennsylvania.
- Q. Is the McClellan-Pro-Slavery Peace-at-any-Price Democracy a dangerous revolutionary party?
A. Yes. When "Little Mac" was in command of the Army of the Potomac, their papers and orators advised him to march on Washington and disperse the Union Congress at the point of the bayonet, instead of marching on Richmond and capturing the rebel Congress, and McClellan never rebuked such advice, thereby tacitly approving their wicked design to subvert our republican government by a military dictatorship.
- Q. Is the McClellan Democracy opposed to "FREE SPEECH"?
A. Yes. They never would allow any discussion on the subject of slavery. Their active men, like Rynders, Wood and company, frequently led mobs to break up anti-slavery meetings, and in their own convention at Chicago, they threatened to kill Harris, of Maryland, because he opposed McClellan's nomination.
- Q. Are they in favor of "arbitrary arrests"?
A. Yes. McClellan arrested and locked up a whole State Legislature, while in session, in Maryland.
- Q. Does the McClellan Pro-Slavery Democracy believe in "coercing a State," when slavery demands it?
A. Yes. They "coerced" Massachusetts to give up Anthony Burns, a fugitive slave, in violation of a State law. They preach "State Rights" in favor of slavery, and protest against the "coercion" of a State in rebellion, and yet "coerce" a State to violate its own laws, when Southern slaveholding rebels demand it.
- Q. Did the McClellan Democracy ever prohibit the circulation of newspapers through the mails?
A. Yes. When Amos Kendall, one of the leaders of that party, was Postmaster General, he issued an order prohibiting Postmasters from mailing Northern anti-slavery papers in the Southern States, and to "burn up" all found in the mails, no matter to whom

they might be addressed; and ordered the Postmasters to tear open the wrappers, to see what sort of papers they contained. THAT ORDER WAS NEVER REVOKED BY A Democratic Postmaster General.

Q. Who advises the breaking up and disturbing of Union meetings?
A. The New York World, (of Sept. 28, 1864), the leading McClellan organ of New York.

Q. Who is Chairman of the McClellan Peace Democratic National Executive Committee?
A. August Belmont, a FOREIGN JEW BANKER. That party OPPOSES THE EMIGRATION OF POOR IRISHMEN, and other poor Europeans to this country, but places at the head of their National Committee a rich foreign banker, the AGENT OF THE ROTHSCHILDS.

Q. Who advocates the dishonest plan of repudiating the National debt, in which thousands of people have invested their money?
A. The McClellan Confederate Democracy, while, at the same time, they advocate the assumption by the National Government of the war debt of the rebellious States. (See their papers and speeches.)

Q. Who groans over the successes of the Union armies, and smiles at their reverses?
A. The McClellan Democratic party, thus showing that their sympathies are with the rebels.

Q. Suppose McClellan should be elected, and die, would not the Peace party under Pendleton (who would then be President) give the rebels all they ask?
A. Yes. Pendleton avows himself in favor of that course, and hopes are already expressed by the Peace Democrats that McClellan would not live out his term, if elected. In that case, Pendleton, Cox, Voorhees, Wood, and other pro-slavery Democrats would comprise the Cabinet, and give the slaveholding rebels all they ask.

Q. Who began and carried on the New York riots in 1862, burning orphan asylums, hanging men, killing women, and butchering children?
A. The men who are now speaking, writing, and waiting to vote for the McClellan pro-slavery Democracy, all Democrats; not one Republican among them.

Q. Who called these murdering, plundering supporters of McClellan Confederate Democracy his "FRIENDS"?
A. Horatio Seymour, the McClellan Democratic candidate for Governor of New York.

Q. Where did Seymour get the majority of votes that elected him Governor in 1862?
A. In those parts of New York city that furnished all the rioters during the "Bloody Week" of '63.

Q. Who told the rebel Governor of Georgia that he was sorry that he could not as Mayor of New York, help Georgia to arm herself against the National Government?
A. Fernando Wood, one of the principal workers in favor of McClellan.

Q. Which party does the Tory aristocracy of England side with: the Lincoln Union party, or the McClellan Confederate Democracy?
A. The McClellan party. The London Times, the great organ of English Tories, praises him and belittles Lincoln. The paper is controlled by the Rothschilds, and their agent, Belmont, is the Chairman of the McClellan Confederate Democracy.

Q. Why is this?
A. Because they know that the success of McClellan favors the South, and the success of the South will break up the Union, weaken us as a nation, and destroy the only free republic on earth, whereas, the success of the Union Lincoln party strengthens the nation and kills the hopes of the British aristocracy in destroying a Government by the people.

Q. Is McClellan in favor of re-enslaving the slaves who have been freed and who have fought for the Union?
A. Yes. In his letter accepting the nomination of the Chicago Confederate Democracy, he declares himself in favor of restoring to the rebellious States ALL the rights they had before the rebellion, including their assumed right to re-enslave all the negroes who have fought our battles.

Q. Is the McClellan Pro-Slavery Democracy a practical ANTAGONIST PARTY?
A. Yes. That party upholds and defends slavery, and every Southern Democratic house is full of the many hued children of "Democratic miscegenation," and that party once had a Vice President of the United States who never had any but a MELATTO WIFE, and she would have been the MISTRESS OF THE WHITE HOUSE, in the event of the President's death.

Q. Is the McClellan Pro-Slavery Confederate Peace Democracy really in sympathy with the Jeff Davis conspirators?
A. Yes. At a McClellan Ratification meeting in Cincinnati, on Saturday, September 17th, there was a large banner in the procession, showing McCLELLAN AND JEFF DAVIS SHAKING HANDS. See the Cincinnati Enquirer of Sunday and Monday, September 18th and 19th, 1864.

Q. How shall we avoid a military Dictatorship?
A. By voting for the Union Lincoln party.

Q. How shall we continue to have "free speech," "free press," and an unmolested mail system—South as well as North?
A. By voting for the Union candidates, Lincoln and Johnson.

Q. How shall we keep clear of "arbitrary arrests"?
A. By voting for the Union Lincoln party, who will re-establish the Union, enforce the laws, and place peace on a firm basis, and all will go on as in old times.

Q. How shall the States be protected in all their just "rights"?
A. By voting for the Union Lincoln party, who will not only guaranty the rights of the States, but they obey the national laws passed by Congress.

Q. How shall we "bring grief" to the British Tory aristocracy?
A. By voting for a Union Lincoln party that is in favor of the FREEDOM of MAN and a Republican Government.

[Concluded on fourth page.]